

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/597,784	06/19/2000	James Crawford	06975-097001	4992	
26171	7590 05/03/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.			BAUGH, APRIL L		
1425 K STRE			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3500			2141	THE ENTITION DEN	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/597,784	CRAWFORD, JAMES				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	April L. Baugh	2141				
The MAILING DATE of this communic Period for Reply	ation appears on the cover she	et with the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FO THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuse. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply within the set of extend	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, mication. days, a reply within the statutory minimum tory period will apply and will expire SIX (6 II, by statute, cause the application to beco	nay a reply be timely filed of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. me ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status		·				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	on					
) This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for		·				
closed in accordance with the practice	e under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935	C.D. 11, 453 O:G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>1-40 and 45-64</u> is/are pendin	g in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are	withdrawn from consideration					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) <u>1-40 and 45-64</u> is/are rejected	ed. ·					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restricti	on and/or election requiremen	l.				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a) accepted or b) objecte	d to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objecti	on to the drawing(s) be held in at	eyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	· ·	wing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to I	by the Examiner. Note the atta	ched Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim fo	or foreign priority under 35 U.S	.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority d						
2. Certified copies of the priority d						
		een received in this National Stage				
application from the Internation * See the attached detailed Office action	, , , ,	not received				
	Tot a not of the dottined doploc	The reserved.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		iew Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or P		r No(s)/Mail Date e of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date		:				
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)	Office Action Summary	Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20050429				

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Claims 1, 14, 29, 30-31 and 36 are amended and claims 53-64 are new; therefore claims 1-40 and 45-64 are now pending.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 14, 29-31, 36, and 45 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-40 and 45-64 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,513,066 to Hutton et al. in view of Haumont et al. (US 2002/0097709)

Regarding claims 1, 29, and 31, Hutton et al. teaches a method, apparatus, and computer program, stored on a computer readable medium for transferring a file from a first client associated with a first subscriber to a communications system to a second client associated with a second subscriber to the communications system, the method comprising: connecting from the first client to a communications system host; sending, through the communications system host,

Art Unit: 2141

a request to the second client to establish a direct connection to the second client (column 7, lines 3-13 and 21-26); establishing a direct connection to the second client that bypasses the communications system host; and transferring a file over the direct connection (column 7, lines 34-40 and column 7, line 66 through column 8, line 14 and column 8, line 50 through column 9, line 15).

Hutton et al. does not teach if a user of the second client accepts the request; establishing a direct connection to the second client that bypasses the communications system host. Haumont et al. teaches if a user of the second client accepts the request; establishing a direct connection to the second client that bypasses the communications system host (page 2, section 0017-0018). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system for establishing point-to-point internet communication of Hutton et al. by if a user of the second client accepts the request; establishing a direct connection to the second client that bypasses the communications system host because this provides security for the 2nd client by allowing them to decide whether to directly communicate with another client on the network.

Regarding claims 14, 30, and 36, Hutton et al. teaches a method, apparatus, and a computer program, stored on a computer readable medium for transferring a file from a first client associated with a first subscriber to a communications system to a second client associated with a second subscriber to the communications system, the method comprising: connecting from the second client to a communications system host; receiving, through the communications system host, a request from the first client to establish a direct connection (column 7, lines 3-13 and 21-26); establishing a direct connection to the first client that bypasses the communications

Art Unit: 2141

system host; and receiving a file over the direct connection (column 7, lines 34-40 and column 7, line 66 through column 8, line 14 and column 8, line 50 through column 9, line 15).

Hutton et al. does not teach enabling a user to accept the request from the first client; establishing a direct connection to the second client that bypasses the communications system host. Haumont et al. teaches enabling a user to accept the request from the first client; establishing a direct connection to the second client that bypasses the communications system host (page 2, section 0017-0018). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system for establishing point-to-point internet communication of Hutton et al. by enabling a user to accept the request from the first client; establishing a direct connection to the second client that bypasses the communications system host because this provides security for the 2nd client by allowing them to decide whether to directly communicate with another client on the network.

Referring to claim 45, Hutton et al. teaches a user interface configured to enable to acceptance or rejection of a file transfer from a first client associated with a first subscriber to a communications system to a second client associated with a second subscriber to the communications system, the user interface comprising: a first graphical user interface element structured and arranged to notify an operator of the second client of a request by the first client to establish a direct connection to the second client, the request being communicated to the second client by a communications system host and the direct connection bypassing the communications system host (column 7, lines 3-13 and 21-26); and a file transfer over the direct connection (column 7, lines 34-40 and column 7, line 66 through column 8, line 14 and column 8, line 50 through column 9, line 15).

Hutton et al. does not teach and a second graphical user interface element structured and arranged to enable an operator of the second client authorize the establishment of the direct connection. Haumont et al. teaches and a second graphical user interface element structured and arranged to enable an operator of the second client authorize the establishment of the direct connection (page 2, section 0017-0018). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the system for establishing point-to-point internet communication of Hutton et al. by and a second graphical user interface element structured and arranged to enable an operator of the second client authorize the establishment of the direct connection because this provides security for the 2nd client by allowing them to decide whether to directly communicate with another client on the network.

Regarding claims 2 and 15, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 1 and 14, wherein the request is authenticated by the communications system host (column 11, lines 59-60).

Regarding claims 3 and 16, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 1 and 14, wherein the second client accepts the request based on indicated preferences of the second subscriber (column 6, lines 28-54).

Regarding claims 4 and 17, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 1 and 14, wherein the direct connection is initiated by the second client (column 7, lines 66 through column 8, line 14).

Regarding claims 5 and 18, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 1 and 14, wherein the direct connection to the second client is established using an IP address of the second client (column 2, lines 20-25).

Application/Control Number: 09/597,784

Art Unit: 2141

Regarding claims 6 and 19, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 1 and 14, further comprising displaying a graphical user interface indicating that a direct connection to the second client is established (column 8, lines 41-45).

Regarding claims 7 and 20, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 1 and 14, wherein the communications system host comprises an instant messaging host (column 1, lines 19-21 and 46-48).

Regarding claims 8 and 21, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 1 and 14, wherein the file comprises a data file (column 4, lines 27-28).

Regarding claims 9 and 22, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 1 and 14, wherein the file comprises a text file (column 1, lines 40-42).

Regarding claims 10 and 23, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 1 and 14, wherein the file comprises a graphics file (column 1, lines 22-23).

Regarding claims 11 and 24, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 1 and 14, wherein the file comprises an audio file (column 1, lines 22-23).

Regarding claims 12 and 25, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 1 and 14, wherein the file comprises a video file (column 1, lines 22-23).

Regarding claims 13 and 28, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 1 and 14, wherein the direct connection is a socket connection (column 7, lines 21-22).

Regarding claim 26, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 14, further comprising receiving an indication that the first subscriber using the first client is composing a message (column 7, lines 36-39).

Regarding claim 27, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 26, further comprising receiving the message composed by the first subscriber from the first client (column 7, line 66 through column 8, lines 3).

Referring to claims 32 and 37, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 31 and 36 wherein the computer readable medium comprises a disc (column 4, lines 17-19 and 28-30).

Regarding claims 33 and 38, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 31 and 36 wherein the computer readable medium comprises a client device (column 3, lines 34-35).

Regarding claims 34 and 39, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 31 and 36 wherein the computer readable medium comprises a host device (column 3, lines 34-35).

Regarding claims 35 and 40, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 31 and 36 wherein the computer readable medium comprises a propagated signal (column 3, lines 17-21).

Regarding claim 46, Hutton et al. teaches the user interface of claim 45 wherein the first graphical user interface element is a dialog box (Fig. 5 & 6, column 9, lines 43-62 and column 10, line 40-column 11, line 3).

Referring to claim 47, Hutton et al. teaches the user interface of claim 45 wherein the second graphical user interface element includes a set of sub elements selectable by the recipient to authorize or reject establishment of the direct connection (Fig. 5 & 6, column 9, lines 43-62 and column 10, line 40-column 11, line 3).

Regarding claim 48, Hutton et al. teaches the user interface of claim 47 wherein the sub elements are option buttons (Fig. 5 & 6, column 9, lines 43-62 and column 10, line 40-column 11, line 3).

Referring to claim 49, Hutton et al. teaches the user interface of claim 47 wherein the sub elements include a sub element selectable to authorize the direct connection (Fig. 5 & 6, column 9, lines 43-62 and column 10, line 40-column 11, line 3).

Regarding claim 50, Hutton et al. teaches the user interface of claim 47 wherein the sub elements include a sub element selectable to reject the direct connection (Fig. 5 & 6, column 9, lines 43-62 and column 10, line 40-column 11, line 3).

Referring to claim 51, Hutton et al. teaches the user interface of claim 47 wherein the sub elements include a sub element selectable to ignore the request (Fig. 5 & 6, column 9, lines 43-62 and column 10, line 40-column 11, line 3).

Regarding claim 52, Hutton et al. teaches the user interface of claim 47 wherein the sub elements include a sub element selectable to warn the first client not to send future requests for a direct connection to the second client (Fig.5 & 6, column 9, lines 43-62 and column 10, line 40-column 11, line 3).

Regarding claim 53, 55, and 57, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 1, 29, and 31 wherein connecting the first client to a communication system host includes connecting from the first client to the communication system host (abstract and fig.1).

Regarding claim 54, 56, and 58, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 14, 30, and 36 wherein connecting the second client to a communications system host includes connecting from the second client to the communications system host (abstract and fig.1).

Regarding claim 59-64, Hutton et al. teaches the method of claim 1, 14, 29, 30, 31, and 36 further comprising enabling the user to perceive the request and monitoring a response by the user to the request (abstract and column 2, lines 6-25 and column 7, lines 21-40).

Conclusion

- 1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to direct file transfer in general: Morvan et al. and Fanning et al.
- 2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to April L. Baugh whose telephone number is 571-272-3877. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/597,784 Page 10

Art Unit: 2141

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER